

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/699,466	-	10/31/2000	Shunpei Yamazaki	0756-2222	8851	
31780	7590	01/26/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ERIC ROB	INSON		SARKAR,	SARKAR, ASOK K		
PMB 955 21010 SOUTHBANK ST.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
POTOMAC	POTOMAC FALLS, VA 20165			2829		
				DATE MAILED: 01/26/2009	DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/699,466	YAMAZAKI ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Asok K. Sarkar	2829				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 07 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	s Brief must be filed within the pR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE:	•					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7 🖂 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a) will not be entered or to the could be rejected is provided be	o)⊠ will be entered and an low or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3 and 62-92.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9.⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). filed 8/30/2004.					

Asse Muna Sarkar

10. Other: For explanation of rejected amended claims, see item # 5.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the Applicant's argument that Suzawa fails to teach "disappearing the block of the nickel element" and "gettering the metal to the oxide film effectively"as a result of the irradiation step are not claim limitations. Removing harmful transition elements from semiconductor devices by the gettering process are well known as suggested by Chen, Similarly, the reason for removing the metal after the crystallization is obvious since metal catalysts are required for promoting crystallization. Multiple gate dielectric layers are obvious as taught by Masumo.